THE NEW IDEAL.

VOL. III. OCTOBER, 1890. No. 10.

TARIFF LESSONS FROM AUSTRALIA.

NEW SOUTH WALES has an area of three hundred and ten thousand square miles, and is larger than New England would be with the addition of New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Maryland, Delaware, Virginia, West Virginia, Ohio, and Indiana. The tariff has always been levied in New South Wales for revenue only; there have never been any duties for the purpose of protection; and nothing is now taxed but alcoholic liquors, tobacco, and groceries. The whole amount of revenue thus collected is only 10 per cent. of the total value of the imports, or about one-third as high a ratio as exists in the United States.

Let us first see what light is thrown by the experience of New South Wales on the theory that high tariffs are needed for building up manufactures, and for keeping wages high. According to protectionist logic, no factories can ever have been erected in the colony, except to be at once crushed out of existence by competition with pauper labor. Wages, however, have always been high in Australia, and at the same time the number of mills, factories, and other industrial establishments in New South Wales has increased steadily, as follows: On the Statistical Register of the colony there were 341 in 1855, 972 in 1864, 2405 in 1874, and 3694 in 1886. In the last year the operatives numbered 45,783, and the horse-power of the steam-engines exceeded 25,000. The colony made a good exhibit of pottery, carriages, and woolen-goods at Philadelphia in 1876; and among the 110 kinds of successful manufactures, in the government list, are agricultural implements, boots and shoes, glass, porcelain, organs, steamships, railroad-cars, and surgical instruments. The export of preserved meat in 1885 was worth $1,500,000; and the Paramatta tweed has a high local reputation. Among instances of increase between 1864 and 1874, were smelting-works from 2 to 25, brick-yards from 187 to 282, wine-presses from 1 to 367, machine, brass, lead, and engineering works from 108 to 158, ship and boat builders from 7 to

103. This last industry grew, under free trade, in New South Wales, while it sank almost out of existence under protection in the United States. During the ten years of which I am speaking, the amount of manufactured goods imported into the colony decreased greatly, though there was an immense gain in population and value of exports. How well her manufactures still flourish may be judged from the fact that they gave employment to more than five per cent. of her people in 1888. The exact figures are 58,060, out of 1,085,740 according to the census; and the amount of capital invested in this class of industries was about $150,000,000. The proportion of value of exports to population was five times as great in New South Wales in 1882 as in the United States in 1880.

The best thing about this growth of manufactures under free-trade is that it is perfectly healthy and spontaneous, like a hardy perennial, and not like a tender exotic liable to be killed by the first ungenial blast. The factories of New South Wales were not legislated into existence by a tariff; and no legislation is likely to prevent them from flourishing. They were proved by actual experiment to be profitable ways of employing labor and capital; and thus they are beyond question beneficial to all the people of the colony, as well as to the owners and managers. They exist as instances of the survival of the fittest.

Wages, according to a book just published, Dilke's "Problems of Greater Britain," "are double as high as in England, for shorter hours; and purchasing power is on the whole equal except with regard to rent, while as regards rent the difference is chiefly caused by men of a higher standard of comfort insisting upon vastly superior accommodation." Another book, entitled "Australian Pictures," gives the daily wages throughout the island in 1884, reckoned at four shillings to the dollar, as $2.50 to $3.25 for blacksmiths and boiler-makers, $2.50 to $3.00 for masons, carpenters, brick-layers, and plasterers, $1.00 with board for ploughmen, and only eight hours for a day's work. There was a general rise soon after. Mr. Froude found in 1885 wages twice as high as in England, and everybody prosperous; and Lady Brassey wrote in 1887 that "Workingmen have a good time in the colonies, if they can only keep sober and are honest and industrious." This has been so from the first. In 1879, for instance, common laborers earned $2.00 a day; and coal-miners averaged $12 to $15 a week, year in and year out, or about twice as much as was earned in 1888 in the Lehigh mines in Pennsylvania. Wages are higher in New South Wales than even in the United States, considering the difference in prices as well as in hours of labor; and this is a good

instance of the universal law, that rate of wages always corresponds to value of production, whatever the tariff. A country which is unusually productive in proportion to its population always pays its laborers well, whether the tariff is as high as our own, or as low as that of New South Wales.

A tariff like ours in purpose, but much lower in rates, has proved compatible with high wages, and with flourishing factories also, in Victoria. She put her factories in 1867 under the protection of duties designed to exclude competition, and ranging from 17 to 25 per cent. So much is admitted free, however, that the proportion of customs-revenue to the total value of imports was but 12 1-2 per cent. in 1889, according to the "Statesman's Year-Book." Dilke estimates it at only 11 per cent., whereas it is 10 in New South Wales. There has been a slight increase in Victoria during the last twelve months; but there is little or nothing of what we call protection in the United States, where window-glass is taxed 200 per cent., and many other necessaries of life over 100, while 30 per cent. of the total value of our imports is collected in our custom-houses. The Democrats were called free-traders by their opponents, in 1888, for trying to reduce our own tariff to an average of 42 per cent.; and no notice was taken of the fact that such a change would have left the system still highly protectionist. So to-day we find all who oppose the McKinley plan for raising duties to an average of more than 50 per cent., called free-traders indiscriminately. We have accordingly good authority for calling Victoria a free-trade country. At all events it is under what American protectionists call a ruinously low tariff, that she has been able to keep the eight-hour law in force for thirty-four years, to pay as high wages as we do, to make enough furniture, machinery, hardware, boots and shoes, wearing apparel, soap and candles for supplying her own wants, and to export large quantities to her neighbors. She, too, furnishes strong evidence of the possibility of relieving the American people from the burden of the present tariff, without running any risk of checking the growth of our industries or lowering the wages of our operatives.

This is the point of real practical importance at present. But there is also a subordinate issue which may be worth touching on briefly; namely, whether New South Wales has been more benefited by tariff purely for revenue than Victoria by a moderate amount of protection. The two colonies lie side by side; but Victoria has a more bracing climate; and her gold mines were much richer than those of New South Wales. The latter has more coal, and a larger territory, but has not allowed so large a part of her settlers to own the land they live on. Victoria had a much

larger population twenty years ago; but the annual increase has been twice as rapid in New South Wales; and the two colonies are now equally populous. Dilke speaks repeatedly of the large and constant migration of laborers from Victoria to New South Wales, where wages are "higher on the whole" (p. 166), especially for unskilled work, while prices are lower on account of the complete escape from protective duties. Those levied on the farmer's implements and supplies in Victoria are so heavy that he has been advised by one of that colony's papers to "Clear out and migrate across the border" into New South Wales; and this course has been taken at various times by many agriculturists. Dilke says that "The protectionist tariff of Victoria has undoubtedly added to the depression of the gold-mining interest by greatly increasing the cost of the machinery." Makers of boots and shoes have complained that they were undersold by manufacturers in New South Wales who got leather free of duty; and the tax on woolen cloth has been a subject for protest from men who had to import it in order to make ready-made clothing. There, as here, it is impossible to protect one industry without taxing articles which other industries must get free of duty in order to flourish.

Another important point is that the exports of New South Wales were worth less than half as much as those of Victoria in 1868, but more than twice as much in 1888. The total value of both imports and exports was nearly twice as great in Victoria as in New South Wales in 1868; and during the twenty years following it rose under free trade to $200,000,000 a year, but only to $150,000,000 under protection. One of the highest authorities on the financial condition of these colonies, Westgarth, declares in his "Half Century of Australasian Progress," published in 1889, that "New South Wales has been already for some years ahead of Victoria in commerce and public revenue: also in amount of accumulated wealth she overtook and surpassed the other." Dilke, too, is satisfied that, "As regards local manufacturing, New South Wales, under her free-trade policy, is slightly ahead of Victoria," "has the advantage in many kinds of goods," "exports a larger amount of her own produce," and "must creep steadily to the front." He also thinks that protection is so far from being necessary in Victoria that her manufacturer "would not suffer by the complete removal." Thus free trade has succeeded better than protection, and at less cost to the people, in developing manufactures in Australia, and in keeping the value of wages high.

The great question before us Americans to-day, however, is not whether the tariff of New South Wales has worked better than that of Victoria, but whether both have not

worked better than our own. Those who consider either of these two Australian systems to be right and good must admit that our own is wrong and bad. Both of these systems lie in the same direction from ours, but at so great a distance that there is no need to ask yet at which of them it would be best to stop. The real issue, on which we are soon to vote, is whether our tariff ought to be so changed as to increase or diminish its great difference not only from free-trade, but even from what in Australia is called ample protection.

F. M. Holland.

EDWARD LIVINGSTON YOUMANS: HIS EARLIER CAREER.*

In one of the most beautiful of all the shining pages of his "History of the Spanish Conquest in America," Sir Arthur Helps describes the way in which, through "some fitness of the season, whether in great scientific discoveries or in the breaking into light of some great moral cause, the same processes are going on in many minds, and it seems as if they communicated with each other invisibly. We may imagine that all good powers aid the 'new light,' and brave and wise thoughts about it float aloft in the atmosphere of thought as downy seeds are borne over the fruitful face of the earth" (vol. iii., page 113). The thinker who elaborates a new system of philosophy deeper and more comprehensive than any yet known to mankind, though he may work in solitude, nevertheless does not work alone. The very fact which makes his great scheme of thought a success and not a failure is the fact that it puts into definite and coherent shape the ideas which many people are more or less vaguely and loosely entertaining, and that it carries to a grand and triumphant conclusion processes of reasoning in which many persons have already begun taking the earlier steps. This community in mental trend between the immortal discoverer and many of the brightest contemporary minds, far from diminishing the originality of his work, constitutes the feature of it which makes it a permanent acquisition for mankind, and distinguishes it from the eccentric philosophies which now and then come up to startle the world for a while, and are presently discarded and forgotten. The history of modern physics—as in the case of the correlation of forces and the undulatory theory of light—furnishes us with many instances of wise thoughts floating like downy seeds in the atmosphere until the moment has come for them to take root. And so it has been with the greatest achievement of modern thinking—

*Extract from *The Modern Science Essayist*, No. 34. Pamphlet, 36 pages, price, 10c. James H. West, Publisher, Boston.

the doctrine of Evolution. Students and investigators in all departments, alike in the physical and in the historical sciences, were fairly driven by the nature of the phenomena before them into some hypothesis, more or less vague, of gradual and orderly change or development. The world was ready and waiting for Herbert Spencer's mighty work when it came, and it was for that reason that it was so quickly triumphant over the old order of thought. The victory has been so thorough, swift, and decisive that it will take another generation to narrate the story of it so as to do it full justice. Meanwhile, people's minds are apt to be somewhat dazed with the rapidity and wholesale character of the change; and nothing is more common than to see them adopting Mr. Spencer's ideas without recognizing them as his or knowing whence they got them. As fast as Mr. Spencer could set forth his generalizations they were taken hold of here and there by special workers, each in his own department, and utilized therein. His general system was at once seized, assimilated, and set forth with new illustrations by serious thinkers who were already groping in the regions of abstruse thought which the master's vision pierced so clearly. And thus the doctrine of Evolution has come to be inseparably interfused with the whole mass of thinking in our day and generation. I do not mean to imply that people commonly entertain very clear ideas about it, for clear ideas are not altogether common. I suspect that a good many people would hesitate if asked to state exactly what Newton's law of gravitation is.

Among the men in America whose minds, between thirty and forty years ago, were feeling their way toward some such unified conception of nature as Mr. Spencer was about to set forth in all its dazzling glory — among the men who were thus prepared to grasp the doctrine of Evolution at once and expound it with fresh illustrations — the first in the field was the man to whose memory we have met here this evening to pay a brief word of tribute. It is but a little while since that noble face was here with us and the tones of that kindly voice were fraught with good cheer for us. To most of you, I presume, the man Edward Livingston Youmans is still a familiar presence. There must be many here this evening who listened to the tidings of his death two years ago with a sense of personal bereavement. No one who knew him is likely ever to forget him. But for those who remember distinctly the man it may not be superfluous to recount the principal incidents of his life and work. It is desirable that the story should be set forth concisely, so as to be remembered; for the work was like the man, unselfish and unobtrusive, and in the hurry and complication of modern life such work is liable to be lost from sight, so that people profit by it without knowing that such work was ever done. So genuinely modest, so utterly destitute of self-regarding impulses was our friend, that I

believe it would be quite like him to chide us for thus drawing public attention to him, as he would think, with too much emphasis. But such mild reproof it is right that we should disregard; for the memory of a life so beautiful and useful is a precious possession of which mankind ought not to be deprived.

Edward Livingston Youmans was born in the town of Coeymans, Albany County, N. Y., on the 3d of June, 1821. From his father and mother, both of whom survived him, he inherited strong traits of character as well as an immense fund of vital energy, such that the failure of health a few years ago seemed (to me, at least) surprising. His father, Vincent Youmans, was a man of independent character, strong convictions, and perfect moral courage, with a quick and ready tongue, in the use of which earnestness and frankness perhaps sometimes prevailed over prudence. The mother, Catherine Scofield, was notable for balance of judgment, prudence, and tact. The mother's grandfather was Irish; and, while I very much doubt the soundness of the generalizations we are so prone to make about race characteristics, I cannot but feel that for the impulsive — one had almost said explosive — warmth of sympathy, the enchanting grace and vivacity of manner, in Edward Youmans, this strain of Irish blood may have been to some extent accountable. Both father and mother belonged to the old Puritan stock of New England, and the father's ancestry was doubtless purely English. Nothing could be more honorably or characteristically English than the name. In the old feudal society the *yeoman*, like the *franklin*, was the small freeholder, owning a modest estate yet holding it by no servile tenure, a man of the common people yet no churl, a member of the state who "knew his rights and knowing dared maintain." Few indeed were the nooks and corners outside of merry England where such men flourished as the yeomen and franklins who founded democratic New England. It has often been remarked how the most illustrious of Franklins exemplified the typical virtues of his class. There was much that was similar in the temperament and disposition of Edward Youmans — the sagacity and penetration, the broad common sense, the earnest purpose veiled but not hidden by the blithe humor, the devotion to ends of wide practical value, the habit of making in the best sense the most out of life.

When Edward was but six months old, his parents moved to Greenfield, near Saratoga Springs. With a comfortable house and three acres of land, his father kept a wagon-shop and smithy. In those days, while it was hard work to wring a subsistence out of the soil or to prosper upon any of the vocations which rural life permitted, there was doubtless more independence of character and real thriftiness than in our time, when cities and tariffs have so sapped the strength of the farming country. In the family of Vincent

Youmans, though rigid economy was practised, books were reckoned to a certain extent among the necessaries of life, and the house was one in which neighbors were fond of gathering to discuss questions of politics or theology, social reform or improvements in agriculture. On all such questions Vincent Youmans was apt to have ideas of his own; he talked with enthusiasm, and was also ready to listen; and he evidently supplied an intellectual stimulus to the whole community. For a boy of bright and inquisitive mind, listening to such talk is no mean source of education. It often goes much further than the reading of books. From an early age Edward Youmans seems to have appropriated all such means of instruction. He had that insatiable thirst for knowledge which is one of God's best gifts to man; for he who is born with this appetite must needs be grievously ill-made in other respects if it does not constrain him to lead a happy and useful life.

After ten years at Greenfield the family moved to a farm at Milton, some two miles distant. Until his sixteenth year Edward helped his father at farm-work in the Summer and attended the district school in Winter. It was his good fortune for some time to fall into the hands of a teacher who had a genius for teaching — a man who in those days of rote-learning did not care to have things learned by heart, but sought to stimulate the thinking powers of his pupils, and who in that age of canes and ferules never found it necessary to use such means of discipline, because the fear of displeasing him was of itself all-sufficient. Experience of the methods of such a man was enough to sharpen one's disgust for the excessive mechanism, the rigid and stupid manner of teaching, which characterize the ordinary school. In after years Youmans used to say that "Uncle Good" — as this admirable pedagogue was called — first taught him what his mind was for. Through intercourse and training of this sort he learned to doubt, to test the soundness of opinions, to make original inquiries, and to find and follow clews.

But even the best of teachers can effect but little unless he finds a mind ready of itself to take the initiative. It is doubtful if men of eminent ability are ever made so by schooling. The school offers opportunities, but in such men the tendency to the initiative is so strong that if opportunities are not offered they will somehow contrive to create them. When Edward Youmans was about thirteen years old he persuaded his father to buy him a copy of Comstock's Natural Philosophy. This book he studied at home by himself, and repeated many of the experiments with apparatus of his own contriving. When he made a centrifugal water-wheel, and explained to the men and boys of the neighborhood the principle of its revolution in a direction opposite to that of the stream which moved it, we may regard it as his earliest attempt at giving scientific

lectures. It was natural that one who had become interested in physics should wish to study chemistry. The teacher (who was not "Uncle Good") had never so much as laid eyes on a text-book of chemistry; but Edward was not to be daunted by such trifles. A copy of Comstock's manual was procured, another pupil was found willing to join in the study, and this class of two proceeded to learn what they could from reading the book, while the teacher asked them the printed questions—those questions the mere existence of which in text-books is apt to show what a low view publishers take of the average intelligence of teachers! It was not a very hopeful way of studying such a subject as chemistry; but doubtless the time was not wasted, and the foundations for a future knowledge of chemistry were laid. The experience of farm-work which accompanied these studies explains the interest which in later years Mr. Youmans felt in agricultural chemistry. He came to realize how crude and primitive are our methods of making the earth yield its produce, and it was his opinion that, when men have once learned how to conduct agriculture upon sound scientific principles, farming will become at once the most wholesome and the most attractive form of human industry.

Along with the elementary studies in science there went a great deal of miscellaneous reading, mostly, it would appear, of good solid books. Apparently there was at that time no study of languages, ancient or modern. At the age of seventeen the young man had shown so much promise that it was decided he should study law, and he had already entered upon a more extensive course of preparation in an academy in Saratoga County when the event occurred which changed the whole course of his life. He had been naturally gifted with keen and accurate vision, was a good sportsman and an excellent shot with a rifle, but at about the age of thirteen there had come an attack of ophthalmia which left the eyes weak and sensitive. Perpetual reading probably increased the difficulty and hindered complete recovery. At the age of seventeen violent inflammation set in, the sight in one eye was completely lost, while in the other it grew so dim as to be of little avail. Sometimes he would be just able to find his way about the streets, at other times the blindness was almost total, and this state of things lasted for nearly thirteen years.

This dreadful calamity seemed to make it impossible to continue any systematic course of study, and the outlook for satisfactory work of any sort was extremely discouraging. The first necessity was medical assistance, and in quest of this Mr. Youmans came in the autumn of 1839 to New York, where for the most part he spent the remainder of his life. Until 1851 he was under the care of an occulist. Under such circumstances, if a man of eager energy and boundless intellectual craving were to be overwhelmed

with despondency, we could not call it strange. If he were to become dependent upon friends for the means of support, it would be ungracious if not unjust to blame him. But Edward Youmans was not made of the stuff that acquiesces in defeat. He rose superior to calamity, he won the means of livelihood, and in darkness entered upon the path to an enviable fame. At first he had to resign himself to spending weary weeks over tasks that with sound eye-sight could have been dispatched in as many days. He invented some kind of writing-machine which held his paper firmly and enabled his pen to follow straight lines at proper distances apart. Long practice of this sort gave his handwriting a peculiar character which it retained in later years. When I first saw it in 1863 it seemed almost undecipherable; but that was far from being the case, and, after I had grown used to it, I found it but little less legible than the most beautiful chirography. The strokes, gnarled and jagged as they were, had a method in their madness, and every pithy sentence went straight as an arrow to its mark.

While conquering these physical obstacles Mr. Youmans began writing for the press, and gradually entered into relations with leading newspapers which became more and more important and useful as years went on. He became acquainted with Horace Greeley, William Henry Channing, and other gentlemen who were interested in social reforms. His sympathies were strongly enlisted with the little party of abolitionists, then held in such scornful disfavor by all other parties. He was also interested in the party of temperance, which, as he and others were afterward to learn, compounded for its essential uprightness of purpose by indulging in very gross intemperance of speech and action. The disinterestedness which always characterized him was illustrated by his writing many articles for a temperance paper which could not afford to pay its contributors, although he was struggling with such disadvantages in earning his own livelihood and carrying on his scientific studies. Those were days when leading reformers believed that by some cunningly contrived alteration of social arrangements our human nature, with all its inheritance from countless ages of brutality, can somehow be made over all in a moment, just as one would go to work with masons and carpenters and revamp a house. There are many good people who still labor under such a delusion.

Though Mr. Youmans was brought into frequent contact with reformers of this sort, it does not seem to me that his mind was ever deeply impressed with such ways of thinking. Science is teaching us that the method of Evolution is that mill of God, of which we have heard, which, while it grinds with infinite efficacy, yet grinds with wearisome slowness. It was Mr. Darwin's discovery of natural selection which first brought this truth home to us; but Sir Charles Lyell had in 1830 shown how enormous effects are

wrought by the cumulative action of slight and unobtrusive causes, and this had much to do with turning men's minds toward some conception of Evolution. It was about 1847 that Mr. Youmans was deeply interested in the work of geologists, as well as in the nebular theory, to which recent discoveries were adding fresh confirmation. Some time before this he had read that famous book, "Vestiges of Creation," and, although Prof. Agassiz truly declared that it was an unscientific book crammed with antiquated and exploded fancies, I suspect that Mr. Youmans felt that amid all the chaff there was a very sound and sturdy kernel of truth.

Mr. Youmans's career as a scientific lecturer now began. His first lecture was the beginning of a series on the relations of organic life to the atmosphere. It was illustrated with chemical apparatus, and was given in a private room in New York to an audience which filled the room. Probably no lecturer ever faced his first audience without some trepidation, and Mr. Youmans had not the main-stay and refuge afforded by a manuscript, for his sight was never good enough to make such an aid available for his lectures. At first the right words were slow in finding their way to those ready lips, and his friends were beginning to grow anxious, when all at once a happy accident broke the spell. He was remarking upon the characteristic instability of nitrogen, and pointing to a jar of that gas on the table before him, when some fidgety movement of his knocked the jar off the table. He improved the occasion with one of his quaint *bons mots*, and, as there is nothing that greases the wheels of life like a laugh, the lecture went on to a successful close.

This was the beginning of a busy career of seventeen years of lecturing, ending in 1868; and I believe it is safe to say that few things were done in all those years of more vital and lasting benefit to the American people. than this broadcast sowing of the seeds of scientific thought in the lectures of Edward Youmans. They came just at the time when the world was ripe for the doctrine of Evolution, when all the wondrous significance of the trend of scientific discovery since Newton's time was beginning to burst upon men's minds. The work of Lyell in geology, followed at length in 1859 by the Darwinian theory; the doctrine of the correlation of forces and the consequent unity of nature; the extension and reformation of chemical theory; the simultaneous advance made in sociological inquiry, and in the conception of the true aims and proper methods of education — all this made the period a most fruitful one for the peculiar work of such a teacher as Youmans.

When such a man goes about for seventeen years, teaching scientific truths for which the world is ripe, we may be sure that his work is great, albeit we have no standard whereby we can exactly measure it. In hundreds

of little towns with queer names did this strong personality appear and make its way and leave its effects in the shape of new thoughts, new questions, and enlarged hospitality of mind, among the inhabitants. The results of all this are surely visible to-day. In no part of the English world has Herbert Spencer's philosophy met with such a general and cordial reception as in the United States. This may, no doubt, be largely explained by a reference to general causes; but as it is almost always necessary, along with our general causes, to take into the account some personal influence, so it is in this case. It is safe to say that among the agencies which during the past fifty years have so remarkably broadened the mind of the American people, very few have been more potent than the gentle and subtle but pervasive work done by Edward Youmans with his lectures, and to this has been largely due the hospitable reception of Herbert Spencer's ideas.

JOHN FISKE.

SONG OF THE HEROIC FOLLOWER.

I will follow to the breech,
I will stay thee day and night,
I will wing thee in my speech
Succoring love for foeman's plight:
  Not in all is eye to lead;
  Some are great in humbler meed!

O my guardian!—take the edge
Of my warrant! I am free
In the storm-pent blade I pledge
For the charge abetting thee:
  Never mine the hand to write
  Terms of dawn in horror's night!

I will tread paths thou mayst break,
I will face no ill in fear,
On thy fortune I will stake
Love, that hath no other ear:
  Not for me the dream to dare
  Fate, alone, on godward stair!

HORACE L. TRAUBEL.

FACTS AND PROBABILITIES IN REGARD TO JESUS.

ACCORDING to frequent statements in the gospels, Jesus often accused his apostles of dullness of apprehension, and wondered at their frequent failures to understand his words and actions. If, however, we give fair consideration to one prominent cause of this apparent dullness, it will perhaps

appear natural and inevitable instead of wonderful. To explain this cause, I must refer to some facts in the history of that period.

It is certain that Isaiah and Jeremiah expected and announced the coming of a descendant of King David, who, ruling the children of Israel as he did, should gather them from all foreign lands into Palestine, rule them there in peace and righteousness, and not only free them from foreign oppression but make all other nations subject to them.

It is certain that the gospels of the New Testament represent the expectations of the whole Jewish people in the time of Jesus as coinciding with these predictions, and that this belief was shared by the disciples and apostles of Jesus through his whole ministry, and even after his crucifixion.

It is certain that Jesus never took the Messianic position so described by Isaiah and Jeremiah; that he never ruled the Jewish people, either literally or spiritually, and that he neither rescued them from oppression nor collected them in Palestine.

If, then, the proper and true meaning of Messiahship was the execution of what Isaiah and Jeremiah predicted, and what, for that reason, the whole Jewish people expected, it necessarily follows that Jesus neither took nor attempted to take the attitude of Messiah. He was Rabbi, but not Lord. He was Teacher, but not Ruler. And, if the statements of the gospels "according to" Matthew and Luke are to be credited, he was not a son of David, but the "begotten" son of God. Of course, then, he was not that Messiah or Christ of whose coming those prophets wrote.

It is certain, however, that, when Jesus began to preach in public, the peculiarities of his doctrine were so emphasized by a commanding personality as to compel the attention and the reverence of those to whom he spoke. He was manifestly different from the Scribes, both in the manner and the substance of his teaching; and, according to the gospel narratives, special gifts of healing-power made his superiority more evident. But at that time, when the Messianic expectation was in full force, the union of power and goodness apparent in Jesus, his ability to help, and his preference of the poor and needy as the objects of help, could not fail to suggest the inquiry, "Is not this the Christ?" His delay in taking the position described by Isaiah and Jeremiah as Messianic was a constant source of surprise to his disciples, but they evidently were in constant expectation that he would take it, especially since he is frequently represented as saying, "My time is not yet come." After his crucifixion they

said, as if now giving up all hope, "We trusted that it had been he who should have redeemed Israel." Can that state of mind be properly called dullness which failed to recognize identity between the actual life and death of Jesus and the Messianic predictions above mentioned? Is it dullness to be unable to reconcile direct contradictions? Yet, as Jews, these disciples felt as absolutely bound to believe in the inspiration of those Messianic prophecies, and expect their fulfillment, as to recognize the greatness of Jesus and the excellence of his doctrine. Placed between the horns of this dilemma, what could they do but stand puzzled and doubtful?

It seems to me that the knowledge which our age has gained through the lessons of history, and the facts elicited by candid criticism, loudly call upon *us* to do that which was impossible for those first disciples, viz.: to recognize and confess that the patriotic dreams of Isaiah and Jeremiah have not been fulfilled, and that no fulfillment of them is to be expected; that, no such Davidic deliverer and ruler having appeared, the name of that personage, Messiah or Christ, does not belong to Jesus, and ought not to be applied to him; that his life, not his death, is the matter with which we are chiefly concerned; and that adoration of the cross, or the display of it as an appropriate symbol of his doctrine, is no fitting expression of our reverence for him; that his permanent fame as the greatest of religious teachers is assured by his emphasis on love and helpfulness to our brethren of mankind as the best and most acceptable offering to God; that his own life of love and helpfulness secures the permanent recognition of him as one of the noblest of men; and, finally, that the view of the close of his earthly life now seeming most probable, namely,* that he was taken from the cross not dead, but in a swoon; that he returned to consciousness in the sepulcher on Friday night under the ministration of Joseph of Arimathea and Nicodemus; that the guard was set sometime on Saturday over the tomb sealed but empty; that Jesus, dressed in the clothes of Joseph's gardener, had brief interviews with Mary Magdalene and with two disciples on the road to Emmaus on Sunday; and that the time of his actual death, in concealment, remains unknown; — frankly to recognize and admit these things, I say, seems to me the duty of the thinking men of the present generation.

CHARLES K. WHIPPLE.

* See THE NEW IDEAL for June, 1890, "Inquiry concerning the Resurrection."

POLITICS, EDUCATION, AND SOCIAL REFORM.

There are four departments of activity within which social improvement is wrought out, the Industrial, the Political, the Philanthropic, the Educational. Industrial progress benefits society; every producer is a helper. Government has its office and liberty cannot yet dispense with law. Much can be accomplished by wise charities to aid the suffering. Education is absolutely essential, especially as to character; for a person's dispositions control his deeds and are largely formative of his opinions.

The relations of politics to industry just now present the most interesting and pressing questions of social reform; and here the Scientific method is now-a-days too often neglected or misapplied. The scientific principle does not prohibit the interference of government with private action to preserve rights or to make people secure in their enjoyment. The question always is, How can this best be done? How can we cure this evil without entailing a greater? The great trouble seems to be the cutting off of opportunities for men to work and earn, and the consequent hopelessness of effort. This state of things never can be helped by socialistic or nationalistic measures, which are impracticable in their nature and dangerous in their application. They are only to be relieved by remedial not revolutionary action, aiming to restrain the power of corporations, to check monopolies, to prevent frauds, to secure the workman his wages, and, as has been so well urged by Prof. Gunton, in securing a general reduction of the hours of labor, so that by increasing the social opportunities of the workingman he may become an integral part of the community and thereby better his economic situation. Assaults on the right of property are assaults on liberty and life. Holding property is not robbery, and we may still adhere to the old-fashioned doctrine that taking it away without an equivalent is robbery, for which there is no justification. "But it is necessary that I live," said the thief before the court, in extenuation of his crime. "I do not see the necessity," wisely replied the magistrate; and society will always agree with him. A restriction of property-holding is the utmost that can legitimately be urged. Entailments and accumulations by will have been already limited. How far the holding of both real and personal property by one individual in his lifetime can be restricted, is a proper question for consideration, but cannot be discussed within the limits of this paper. For ends which involve the common liberty the State powers always may be used; but we should be reluctant to permit such

interference in industrial matters, because experience has universally shown that from this harm is more apt to result than good.

Passing now to our political conditions, it is to be remarked that the chief iniquity at present is the use of the powers of government and official position for private ends. Abuse of public trust for personal gain is often no bar to political preferment. It is common for those in office to think first of their own profit. One class of evils is thus presented. Another is found in the constant use of legislative functions to support private interests. To purify our governmental offices and to limit legislation to general purposes seem to be the two things of transcendent importance in American politics, the country over. It is hard to see how either of these desiderata is to be obtained by increasing the number of official positions and functions and creating a necessity for more legislative measures. Rather it would seem to be the true course to abolish a great many of the offices we have, and to dispense with a considerable portion of the laws on our statute-books. The business condition of the country is much better settled when Congress is not in session. Those States which have adopted for their legislatures the biennial session rule, have found it greatly to their advantage. If the legislature seldom meets there is so much less opportunity for schemes of jobbery, while people can live and justice be administered under the organic law and the general statutes which all our States have had from the beginning. So-called "private bills" are the curse of our Congressional and State legislation. The lower house of Congress has almost ceased to be available for the discussion and enactment of measures affecting the general welfare. It is merely a vehicle for the promotion of private schemes, and its action is the resultant of the conflict of private interests, each seeking by force, frauds or compromise the passage of its own bills. It were far better to have no legislature for an interval, than to have this unseemly strife kept up through several months of each year. In executive offices, longer terms and stricter accountability will tend to create a better state of things, while the reforms in the civil service which have been effected, and others which are proposed, are of great value for their salutary results.

But it is not so much my purpose to particularize by indicating special reforms for special cases, as to remark the fact that, in America and in England at least, the practical workers for reform, and their proposed measures, are the most scientific. In England this is illustrated in the new and simplified judicial procedure, in the Corrupt Practices Act, and in the various Home Rule movements.

In our own country, the three most salient reforms of to-day — Civil-Service, Tariff, and Ballot-Reform — are the offspring of thoroughly scientific thought, starting from conditions, gathering the facts, exposing the evils and their causes, and selecting the appropriate remedy. This is very encouraging. Two extreme and opposite habits of mind should always be avoided and deprecated; the one, that of the theorist and doctrinaire, who has found one general principle which so possesses his mind that he can think of no other, and who applies it in season and out of season without the slightest reference to conditions. The other *bête noire* is the man who is so short-sighted that he never can see beyond his nose, who hates a theorist much more than he hates the devil, because he regards the latter as a thoroughly practical being, and whose thought never transcends the expediency of the moment. Of the two, the former state is to be preferred. It is better, I suppose, to "hitch your wagon to a star,"— which may indeed drag you along roughly, not always in the road, but will still keep you moving over magnificent distances and cheer you with its light. If on the other hand you attach it to a purblind ass, the beast will take you nowhere, but will presently demolish your vehicle, and perhaps yourself, with its vicious kicks. The true method for politics is that described by Wordsworth Donnisthorpe in a recently published work: — "The need should be insisted on for the thorough study of law in the concrete, and the discovery, not the manufacture, of the true statical laws which are actually operative in societies; of their tendency and of the dynamical laws of their change and development. It is by the discovery of these laws that we shall find ourselves in possession of true and useful practical guides through the labyrinth of legislation and politics. . . . The art of politics is the application of the science of nomology to the concrete, just as engineering is the application to human wants of the science of mechanics, and as navigation is one of the arts based on the science of astronomy; until we have mastered the science we shall make little progress with the corresponding art. . . . To-day we are on the high road to Socialism; to-morrow the fates only know where we shall be. The only cure for this policy of drift is a patient and intelligent study . . . whereby middle principles of practical application are to be brought to light and the absurd fallacies of social doctrinaires put to flight forever."*

I shall not pause to speak of practical philanthropy, further than to remind you that charity never will take the place of justice, and is at best the temporary not the ultimate

* "Individualism; A System of Politics," IX.

relief for suffering human nature. Largesse will not condone oppression, nor benevolence dispense with equity.

I pass on to say a word, in conclusion, upon what is, after all, the extreme, the fundamental practical method of improving society, namely, the Educational. To this we are always obliged to return. "To cure the soul," says Plato,—"that is the first thing." "He that doeth my will," said Jesus, "shall know of the doctrine"—right action will bring knowledge. But on this vast theme my limits will allow me to touch only two or three points, which seem just now to demand consideration.

The first of these relates to the importance of a special institution, namely, the public-school system, and the increasing of its opportunities as well as its efficiency. The scientific ground for public education is that of security to the State. To educate at public expense is by far the most economical way in which social order can be promoted. Schools cost less and are much more efficient than penitentiaries. If properly conducted, and if the system be so constituted as to secure a practically universal education as far as the course goes, the community will be spared much trouble and the process of renovating humanity will go on much faster. At the present time there is a disposition in many quarters to dispense with or curtail public-school education. This has appeared on both scientific and religious grounds. No more fatal error could be committed. The day when public schools are abolished in any American community will be a dark day. To educate the young person in character and in knowledge, particularly that knowledge which relates to his duties as a citizen, is the one thing of paramount interest to the State, which it never can afford to neglect; for upon such education, that cannot safely be left to private effort, depends the maintenance of the common freedom which in its turn is the safeguard of individual liberty and the surety of individual development.

The second line of educational effort which I propose to indicate looks to the breaking down of the barrier between business and social life. A man may rob and steal in business ways below Fourteenth Street, when above that line he is bound in honor to prefer his neighbor. Business is war, and it is not good business principle to "live and let live." So long as the humanities are kept out of the counting-house or the store, good morals, good citizenship, good character cannot be depended upon. The co-operative idea, when divested of its socialistic tendencies, is certainly worthy of encouragement and should be constantly applied to industrial life. This would involve, in addition to what I have before suggested, some system of profit-sharing, and

above all a greater permanence and certainty of tenure in employment, so that the laborer be not regarded as a machine but as a person, be provided for in case of sickness, and be not subject to dismissal on a day's notice, irrespective of faithful service, at the supposed interest or maybe the whim of an employer. Beyond this, when we come to the relations of those more nearly equal in business life, if we cannot have sympathy it is surely not too much to expect (which in these days seems to be going out of fashion), and a state of morals wherein a lie is not considered, as it has been styled, "an intellectual mode of meeting a difficulty."

The third and last suggestion I have to offer is another caution. It is said that "Knowledge is power," thereby implying that it is not itself the ultimate end of human life, but is of value because it gives a wider field and a greater effectiveness to action. The strongest desires and aspirations are satisfied only in an activity which is forever creating. Knowledge, indeed, is often an end in itself, because learning is a process of activity which selects and forms new objects, not before present, to the mind; but it is only under the stimulus of ideals which by contrast produce a felt insufficiency of present conditions, a dissatisfaction with what is, that the process of self-development goes on to its fullest consummation. This creative instinct must be exercised, or it will become atrophied, and then growth ceases and decadence begins. We must therefore consider that, good as science is, it is in the art-impulse and its products that we behold, after all, the source and the end of individual and social progress. It is in the unknown, which furnishes possibilities of knowing, the unachieved which presents possibilities of achievement, that we find the moving cause of our exertion to know and to do. It is necessary to ascertain what is, and see things as they are; but if we become accustomed to the thought that scientific observation and experiment upon phenomena presented is the only worthy object of mental activity, we shall be in great danger of drying up the fountain of all intellectual and moral vitality. The greatest discoveries of science, themselves, never could have been made without the ideals of art, which set the goal for science to reach; and human life never has been made better save under the inspiration of some ideal of perfection, which is a product of intellectual creativeness. Let us, then, not make the mistake of despising art, whose aim is to eliminate the painful and disagreeable and to produce that which does not perish in the using. Nor should we seek to reduce all art to science, according to the doctrine of M. Zola in literature; but rather leave room for the movement of the creative spirit,

which loves to cast off the trammels of the earthy, to soar aloft with ethereal wings, to enter the limitless, to burst into the unknown and filch therefrom something precious for science to work upon and reduce to orderly relations. Our life in the actual must needs occupy us most: but it is in the sphere of the possible, not yet realized, that we find the renewing and strengthening atmosphere, breathing which the blood is sent more swiftly through our veins, rendering us buoyant and able for the tasks before us. While, therefore, we should respect the work of science, and insist on true science, within its own domain, let us not forget that he who is the author of a great artistic creation, clothing matter with mind and moulding Nature to express an idea, enriches the world with the production of his genius, but also exemplifies that man may walk with the gods, that he is himself a creator and finisher; and even suggests that death and nothingness are after all but names which only indicate a vast reservoir of being without beginning or end, wherein lies concealed and from which shall spring forth, eternally and exhaustlessly, an ever-changing and never-ending life.

DANIEL GREENLEAF THOMPSON.

ON READING MATTHEW ARNOLD'S ESSAY ON HEINE.

["I know not if I deserve that a laurel-wreath should be laid on my coffin; but lay on it a *sword*, for I was a brave soldier in the Liberation-War of Humanity."]

"A soldier in the war for Liberty."
What buried hopes lie all unnoticed here!
What agonies of scornèd sympathy,
What pity mocked, what love returned with fear!
Yet how he sings, with voice so trumpet-clear,
With kindling eyes that through the future see,
"Lay ye a sword upon my wreathless bier,
O comrades in the war for Liberty!"

And is the sword a-rust that gleamed so bright?
And does the pen still follow slavishly?
Still do the custom-tyrants from their height
Of custom-guarded thrones gaze mirthfully?
Ah no! Ah no! Still surge the waves of fight;
As once ye battled, now are battling we,
O leaders in the struggle for the Right,
O comrades in the war for Liberty!

H. A. WARREN.

WAGES AND TARIFFS.

A REPLY TO MR. F. M. HOLLAND.

It is always with unalloyed pleasure and community of conviction that the writer peruses the productions of the author of "Wages and Tariffs," published in The New Ideal for June, 1890, except when he has touched upon the above topic. In Mr. F. M. Holland's article under the above caption, he strays wofully, I fear, from his customary logical and altogether delightful writing. On this subject there appears to me to be a very great deviation from his generally clear-cut and convincing methods of ratiocination.

First, as to Mr. Holland's statement that "there is no necessary connection of high wages with high tariffs." The undoubted fact that higher wages obtain in some free-trade than in some protected countries has so often been mistakenly used as showing that protection has no effect upon the wages of a country, or, if any, to keep them down, that it is high time that this apparently logical but most deceitful conclusion should be given a little more attention by protectionists and shown in its true light. It is quite true that in Germany, and other continental countries with protective tariff systems, wages rule lower than in free-trade Great Britain. On the other hand, under a protective tariff in the United States, wages rule much higher than in any European country to be named, whether it be under free-trade or protection, averaging nearly double that of the highest-wages country of Europe — Great Britain. The mere rate of wages, however, does not represent the status of the workers in any country, but the value of these wages to the recipients of them. The worker's ability, by means of them, to live and save, is the true measure.

The advocates of the protection policy do not claim that protection primarily establishes high wages in any country, or places the worker originally in a higher status as to living and saving; nor is it claimed by them that the results of a protective system must be the same in every country, nor that it could bring about an equality of wages in every country adopting it — that high protection in Holland, for example, or even in Great Britain, could ever place the workers of those countries on the same plane as to the rate or value of wages as in the United States. They do claim, however, that the naturally high-wages values obtaining in this country or in any country over those of another, from causes entirely independent of either free trade or protection, are maintained and prevented from falling to the level of less favored countries by the protective system.

Every country exists to-day under certain conditions as to ratio of population to land-area, natural resources, energy of character, skill and intelligence of its inhabitants, social and governmental conditions, and many other factors which enter into the industrial status of a nation or people and which establish originally the comparative values among them or the wages-values of its workers,— factors of its existence primarily independent of any question of political economy whatever. They may be said to have come into existence as the result of a given nation's environment and resources and its past history, conjoined with the characteristics of the races of people from whom they are descended. The United States is a comparatively new country, possessed of practically unlimited natural resources of every kind that contribute to man's use and welfare; as yet of small ratio of population to land-area; with a popular form of government, the least expensive to maintain; a standing army confined to a comparatively insignificant scale; free from anything like royal or titled leeches to suck the blood of the people;—in a word, so conditioned as to establish a higher-wages value for its workers than any other nation known to-day. I might go on and point out how Russia, Great Britain, Germany, Italy, and other countries, are below us in all that should tend to make wages high, but this will be, and is, admitted by Mr. Holland and those who reason with him.

Now, the factors of comparative national and material prosperity pointed out above are independent of any question of interchange of products or international dealing among them, and we have but to ask what will be the effect of certain regulations of commerce and interchange of products—whether they will affect for good or ill this country or that, or whether they will tend to modify the status of any two nations as primarily fixed by the considerations named.

I think the proposition may be stated in simple form, designating the several countries as high or low value nations, according as the wages-values of their workers may be primarily established by the uncommercial factors already considered. The simple proposition is that a nation cannot exchange products with a lower-value nation, where the natural resources of both admit of identical products, without detriment to the wages-values of the first, and corresponding advantage to those of the last. Thus, we, or our workers, must suffer under a free interchange between ourselves and protective Germany to a greater extent than between us and free-trade Great Britain, and even still more between us and protective Italy.

There are several reasons why this fact has not in the past forty years applied itself strictly to Great Britain, to

enumerate which would extend this article too greatly; but it is to-day becoming manifest, even in free-trade England — which until within about forty years past was a protection country — that it must soon look to tariff-protection again against its lower-value neighbors, Germany, Belgium, and Italy; and the outcry for some such legislation is greater in Great Britain to-day than the disciples of Cobden are willing to admit.

As a humanitarian principle, which would contribute the greatest good to the greatest number in the world at large, no one denies that universal free trade would be the ideal condition; but, as every country designs to aid its own people in all economic measures as against all the others, it is but self-defense on our part to defend ourselves in a like manner; and, as we are occupying naturally the highest economic status, we must of necessity protect ourselves against all others.

The truth is, then, that the protective system does not establish or cause higher-wages values in this country, but it does prevent them from falling to the level of lower-value countries, whether the latter be protective, or free-trading among themselves or with us. Mr. Holland, however, I am glad to find, does not advocate that millennial humanitarianism which would demand that we share our superior opportunities with less-favored nations, for he does not hesitate to advocate the cutting off of Canadian forests, to the detriment of Canada and in our behoof.

Mr. Holland asks, "Is it on account of the tariff that a watch-maker is better paid than a hod-carrier?" and I will ask, Has he ever found an advocate of protection that contended for such an absurd proposition? Is there any nearer approach to equality in this respect under a protective tariff than in free-trade countries, or the reverse? Does not "the best wages go to the man who does the most valuable work" in any country? But he begs the question when he says that this is just as true of an "American against a Russian as of a watch-maker against a hod-carrier." Under the American tariff-policy there are no American hod-carriers, and, if there were, there would not be any such difference between an American and a Russian hod-carrier as his argument would imply; in point of fact, it is doubtful, in such a sphere of activity, if the Russian would not outstrip the American. The idea so often promulgated by free-traders that an American workman is more efficient as a man, and aside from any consideration of the use of labor-saving inventions peculiar to this country, has no better foundation than may be looked for in the giving on the part of professional politicians to the American workmen what would vulgarly be designated as political "taffy." There is no such difference in men.

Mr. Holland says, "wages depend upon production," and "any country productive enough to supply abundantly all the wants of civilized people must of necessity be a place where labor is paid well, whatever the tariff." Why, then, in England, which has been productive in manufactures beyond every other country on the globe, are wages at about one-half, and wages-values to the workingman at about three-fifths, of those in this country? According to Mr. Holland's aphorism, England should be the highest-wages country on the earth, whatever her tariff. To be sure, she does not produce *all* the wants of civilized people, nor does any country. Mr. Holland says that there is no difference between free-traders and protectionists as to how the rate of wages is affected by increase in the number of laborers; and here he is again mistaken, for there is a wide difference in this respect. Protectionists believe that it is a great deal more to the advantage of the workers in this country that laborers should come here from other countries, to swell the numbers of both consumers and producers, than that the products of that vastly greater number of, and generally poorer, laborers who do not and generally cannot come, should be admitted free; and for the naturally obvious reason that every laborer who comes here is not only a competitor among laborers, but a consumer of some other laborer's product, and thus a market-maker as well as a competitor. But your free-trader generally holds up to our gaze the terrible fact that labor is admitted free, and that competition in wages is greater on this account, ignoring or forgetting the fact that these laborers must eat, live, and wear clothing to be produced by somebody and sold to them, in return for the wages they earn, and therefore proportionally and measurably increasing the demand for labor.

Mr. Holland in one place says, "the welfare of the operative requires that productiveness should outstrip population," and in another place complains, with Mr. W. C. P. Breckinridge, "that in all the great protected industries the factories can turn out in seven months goods enough to supply the present market for a year." If "factories can turn out a third more product than our people can consume," as quoted from the *North American Review* and the *Forum*, because of protection, is this not exactly in accord with Mr. Holland's ideal proposition that "the welfare of the operative requires that productiveness should outstrip population"? But assuming this to be true in the United States,—which I deny,—what is the reason that free-trade England is working so strenuously for our market? Free-traders say that she supplies vast quantities of manufactures to other countries foreign to her—which is true enough; but it is equally true that she has not market enough of that kind, and wants ours in

addition. Is not England, then, in a position such that her factories can turn out in a fraction of a year what her own people could consume, if confined to them? But, says your free-trader, she supplies the outside world with her surplus manufactures, while we, because of protection, do not. Let us see what this fact implies.

"One of the most serious checks upon production in the United States," says Mr. Holland, "has been the danger to glut the market," and yet he would admit the products of other countries of the same character, without even a suspicion that this would tend in the least to glut our market. Great Britain has glutted the markets of the world with her manufactures, or she would not try so hard for a greater share in ours. How, then, can we expect to supply, or contend with her in supplying those countries, unless we compete with her as to prices? The ultimate value in every product is nearly all labor. If she can obtain that labor for less than one-half what we pay, we can only compete in foreign markets with her by bringing our wages-values down to hers; and we begin to see where the tariff, as Mr. Blaine has said, is merely a question of wages.

Now, if we cannot compete with European countries in other countries foreign to them and to us, where shall we find a market for our manufactures? Obviously not in the European countries themselves, which are already producing so much more than they can consume as to be obliged to depend upon markets foreign to them to buy and consume their surplus manufactures, and which, because of having already glutted these markets, are moving heaven and earth to procure ours — the largest, and, because of our higher wages and standard of values, the best-paying market in the world: more than equal, in fact, to all the others put together. Does Mr. Holland, then, or any other sane man, believe that under free-trade to-morrow there would not be imported into this country, at the lower prices at which they can be produced abroad, five dollars' worth of manufactured articles for every one dollar's worth we could possibly export either to the cheaply producing countries of Europe or to the already glutted markets supplied by them, or to both combined,— beyond what we now do under protection? and if this be true, does it not follow that four-fifths of the workers now supplying our own markets with manufactures must do something else or become idle, under free-trade? If the latter, they will have nothing wherewith to purchase the cheaper imported articles they may need, and can only return to the receipt of wages when they become low enough to exclude the cheaper foreign goods; so that, even under free trade, the foreign products would be ultimately excluded,—but only when our own

wages-values and the status of our workers had fallen to the level of theirs. Wages again!

Can these laborers do something else? What? Your free-trader says that they can go to farming; and then in the same breath avers that protection is the curse of the farmers. What must be the result if four-fifths, or one-half, or one-quarter of our present manufacturing population turn farmers? Compete with the present farm-worker for his wages. Wages again! Drive it into any corner you will, you finally have the spectre of low wages, which haunts every country whose manufactured products the free-traders would admit free, glaring at you with the terror born of hunger and oppression.

Free-traders are fond of adverting to strikes, lock-outs, and other labor struggles in this country, and are ever ready to quote pamphlets on "labor, wages, and tariffs," published by so-called "Reform Clubs," such as this, for instance, which Mr. Holland quotes: "The year closes with little improvement in the industrial situation; strikes and lock-outs are reported in every direction," etc, etc. But they are very careful to avoid all reference to greatly worse conditions of this kind in those countries which they would have us imitate as to tariffs and wages.

Mr. Holland says plainly: "Our wage-earners need markets in which there is no danger of glutting, and no excuse for cuts, lock-outs, or trusts." This would be an ideal state of things for them, doubtless; but where is this market to be found? Of a certainty not in those markets of the world already glutted by England, Germany, Belgium, and France, and as obviously not in the countries named themselves, because it has been with their surplus products only that they have glutted their foreign markets; and as for trusts, where will Mr. Holland find them in their more glaring fullness than in free-trade Great Britain? But Mr. Holland says, "the home market is not large enough." That is bad, if true; and we should strain every nerve to enlarge it, as protection proposes; but we certainly cannot do it by allowing others to supply it, and it is self-evident that we cannot substitute any other for it as good, so long as others have already so far glutted them that, for a further extension of their market, ours must be had, if they can get it. May the day be long before the people of the United States consent to it, say I.

Mr. Holland says, quoting Mr. J. B. Sargent of New Haven: "In articles requiring a large amount of labor and comparatively small amount of raw material we can hold our own with any foreigners. When the raw material is large in proportion to the labor, the Englishman is on top." Now, it is well-known that not only does the present protective tariff provide for a remission of all duties within

ten per cent. on all raw materials imported which are used in articles of export, but the McKinley bill goes further and practically admits all raw materials free which shall be exported again as an ingredient of exported American articles, rebating the whole duty thereon except one per cent. Certainly, neither Mr. Sargent nor Mr. Holland will attempt to contend that this one per cent. on his raw material will put the Englishman on top. If it does, what becomes of Mr. Holland's vaunted superiority of Americans, through which "the average American workman" is said to be able to "perform from one and one-half to twice as much work in a given time as the average European workman"? In a more unfavorable situation does Mr. Sargent place Mr. Holland when he says: "These goods cost manufacturers at least thirty per cent. too much, because of the duty on raw materials. If that duty were removed, I, for one, would apply ten per cent. of the saving to under-selling the English in foreign markets; I would add ten per cent. to the wages of my men, and the other ten per cent. would go nicely in my own pockets." In view of the provision of the McKinley bill above referred to, this is as much as to say that for some reason American workmen fail by twenty-nine per cent. of being able to compete in foreign markets in Mr. Sargent's product, everything else being equal; and the agent of the Bristol Clock Company, whom Mr. Holland quotes further on, admits or claims that this differenee amounts to sixty per cent., which, in the form of duty, he is obliged to pay on his raw material.

Now, the palpable fact is that raw materials for finished exports, under the McKinley bill, will be practically free; but the difference and the inability of Americans to compete with Europe in foreign markets will still exist, as it does now, and as I trust it always will exist, from the sole cause that the cost of labor here is anywhere from two to three times what it is in Europe, which can only in part be offset by the superior labor-saving inventions of the Americans.

Even the undoubted fact that American manufacturers are able to produce more per man per hour than the lower-wages countries of Europe is due mainly to the protective principle under which this government has been conducted principally for a hundred years. The low wages of Europe offer little incentive to the inventor of labor-saving devices, while our high rates are a constant stimulus to the inventor, and thus we use vastly more of labor-saving inventions, which enable the American workmen to produce more per hour per man.

But the fact remains that, while an American worker is able to produce more than his European brother, as aided by labor-saving devices, the amount of advantage due to

this does not nearly compensate for the very great disparity in wages between this and European countries. If this disparity were a doubtful, insignificant fraction, the case would be different; but the great fact in this connection which the free-traders persistently ignore, or belittle, is that wages in this country average fully double, and wages-values to the workingmen not less than one and two-thirds, what they are in Great Britain, the highest-wages country in Europe, while in some European countries the wages-rates are less than one-third the American rates. These are the stubborn facts that no amount or system of free-trade logic, or lack of logic, that can be paraded under the much-abused name of "tariff reform" can weaken or set aside. The demon of low wages meets your free-trader at every turn.

Mr. Holland finally says: "It is easy to see that our tariff checks production in so many ways as to cause wages to be decidedly lower than they would otherwise be." This is an easy sentence to write, no doubt; and, if he will only show us how the admission free to this country, of products already made here by thousands of workers, at lower prices than the latter can now produce them for our own market, can be accomplished without reducing wages, instead of increasing them, it would be as easy to comprehend as to write.

As to the quotation from Mr. Powderly, with which Mr. Holland concludes his paper: A more pronounced protectionist than he has indicated himself to be in some of his speeches and writings, it would be hard to find. A man who blows hot one day and cold the next, as may suit the exigencies of his situation, should not count for much on a question of this kind.

The tariff, so far as it affects the workingman, is a question simply of wages, and the American workman will do well to lay that broad fact close to his heart.

J. T. Hawkins.

REJOINDER BY MR. HOLLAND.

I am glad to see that Mr. Hawkins agrees with me on the point that wages were originally made high in this country by natural advantages, through which labor came into possession of its just reward, long before we had any tariff. Our main difference is that he considers protection necessary in order to prevent wages from falling to as low a level here as in less fortunate lands.

He admits that his theory does not apply to the relations of Great Britain with Germany, Belgium, and Italy; and it is equally lacking in the case of her relations with France, Spain, and Russia. All the six have lower wages than Great Britain, but high tariffs much like our own. They pay less than one-half as high wages as New South Wales, which has what is strictly a free-trade tariff, or than Victoria, which has rates almost as far below those insisted upon by American protectionists. Three times six makes eighteen "stubborn facts" against a theory, whose author claims only one for its support.

And that solitary instance will not help him so much as it would to show even one case where a fall in wages followed a reduction of the tariff. This experiment has been tried repeatedly, and, so far as I know, always with the same result. The condition of the working-classes in England was deplorable before the establishment of free trade in 1846. The result of free trade is that wages are now twice as high in purchasing power as they were fifty years ago, and the improvement has been much greater than in any country where there are high tariffs. It was after seven years of gradual reduction had brought our duties down nearly to 20 per cent., that the factory-girls began to publish the *Lowell Offering* in a city from which, according to Lyell, a traveler might "go away with the idea that he had been seeing a set of gentlemen and ladies playing at factory for their own amusement." Desire for larger revenue caused an increase of tariff in 1842; but the result was so unsatisfactory that there was a sudden reduction in 1846 and another in 1857. Between 1850 and 1860 we had a low tariff, with duties (says Colonel Wright) "decreasing from 27 to 19 per cent."; but the average increase of wages in factories, in proportion to number of operatives, was nearly 20 per cent., almost twice as great as it was under high tariffs and high prices between 1870 and 1880. The figures from which I make this calculation are given by the Tariff Commission of protectionists, appointed in 1882. The savings-bank commissioners of this State reported, in 1887, that the average annual increase of savings, in proportion to population, during these ten years of low-tariffs, was 16 per cent., and that this gain was ten times as great as that made since 1880. Both in the United States and in Great Britain, wages rose with unusual rapidity as tariffs fell.

Moreover, we cannot be sure that the one solitary fact appealed to by my critic is anything more than a chance coincidence. To say, "We have high wages with a high tariff, and therefore we could not have them without it," is as illogical as it would be to say, "Rheumatism does not trouble me now, while I have a horse-chestnut in my

pocket; and so I feel sure that I could not be well if I did not carry one there." The presumption that our tariff is not needed to keep wages high, is strongly favored by a fact which Mr. Hawkins admits, namely, that it did nothing originally to make them so. Long before America was protected by a tariff she had high wages, as before pointed out, on account of her superiority in natural advantages. These advantages will not be obliterated by a reduction of our tariff; on the contrary, their power to bless our laborer will grow as our country comes into freer intercourse with nations whose lack of natural advantages and of political freedom has made their wages low. Such nations are our inferiors; and our superiority will increase as competition with them inspires us to put forth our full strength. To shun the competition is as foolish as it would be for a man of strong intellect to shut himself in a cave for fear that his brain will soften if he has anything to do with his fellow-men. This mistake was often made during the dark ages; when the world was also cursed with the superstition of thinking that no nation could trade safely with any other. How far it is behind our day to think that the only way to save our laborers from the poor-house is to restrict commerce, must be plain to every one who notices what eager approval has recently been given by our protectionists to Mr. Blaine's new schemes for expanding our trade with Cuba, Brazil, and other countries whose workmen are much worse off than ours. Why fear "the demon of low wages" after he has been exorcised by the magic spell, reciprocity?

Mr. Hawkins thinks he sees this demon still haunting the English factories; but it is only a spectral illusion. Free trade drove him out long ago. Careful comparison of this country with England showed that the difference in wages, in the cotton-factories, was very slight, according to the Report made by Secretary Blaine in 1881. A protectionist paper, the *New York Press*, said a year ago, "Wages average 50 per cent. more in the United States than in England, and living about 17 per cent. more." On October 30, 1888, it stated editorially that it takes 185 days' work to pay for rent, food, and clothes in England, and 183 in this country. One of the ablest authorities, Lyon Playfair, is satisfied that our real superiority in "wages-values" is but slight. At all events there is not so much justice now as there was fifty years ago, when we had a lower tariff than the British, in calling England the workingman's hell, and America his paradise. The most poorly-paid labor in England is the agricultural; and with that we compete successfully. How little danger there is of her glutting our markets when we reduce our tariff, may be judged from what is stated on another page about New South Wales, as

well as from the fact that the reduction of 1846 enabled us to double the product of our factories and make our export of manufactured goods four times as great as it had been under protection. We are not likely, even under free trade, to exchange products, unless we profit by it, and obtain other products worth more to us than those we give; and it is an advantage to labor, in the long run, to have it employed in callings where it produces most wealth, for the business extends and the demand for labor multiplies.

It is not necessary to the strength of my position that I confirm or repeat the evidence presented in my former article as to the great efficiency of American workmen. Productiveness is not to be measured by the amount of goods which might be produced if there were better markets, but by the amount actually exported or otherwise consumed. Mr. Hawkins gives no instance of an English Trust; but some have been organized there for doing business, under the protection of our tariff, in America.

One more fact, to which I call particular attention, is that what we (if the McKinley bill now before Congress passes) must soon cease to speak of as "the present tariff" did not remit duties on any raw materials except those contained in "articles *wholly* manufactured of materials *imported*." There has been nothing to help Mr. Sargent export a lock made — even to the slightest extent — of iron which cost him 50 per cent. more in Pennsylvania than it would have done under free trade, or reciprocity, in Nova Scotia. The McKinley tariff would enable him to get rebate on a lock made partly of Scotch or Nova-Scotia iron, provided that exactly how much he had used of such materials could be proved from the appearance of the finished article. There is nothing in either tariff to lessen the check which protection gives to exportation by raising the price of such materials as are not imported. This indirect increase of cost is not met in any way by repayment of duties, and diminishes the demand for labor in many manufactures. Where the materials do come directly from abroad they are not usually imported by the manufacturer, and the difficulty of proving the exact amount, and the red-tape and other hindrances, have been found in practice to be too great to admit of any general use of the remedy. It looks pretty in the bill, but it has hardly any value. It is like the generosity of giving sailors leave to go ashore in mid-ocean.

F. M. H.

WAS JESUS AN ETHICAL RELIGIONIST?

An ethical religionist is one who, whatever views of God, immortality, or other dogma or article of creed he may hold, does not make any one or all of these either fundamental to or the essence of religion; but who makes religion to consist in the love and service of fellow-creatures. Was this the religion of Jesus?

In attempting briefly to answer this question I shall refer only to the confessedly imperfect records of the New Testament, and shall assume that the epitomized statements in which Jesus is made to sum up the whole matter are to be accepted in preference to other remarks attributed to him which may contradict the passage referred to and teach another and contrary doctrine. Moreover, I shall not make much account of the fact that Jesus might have found some precedent for his views in the prophets: as, for example, in Hosea's teaching that the "acceptable fast" is to "deal thy bread to the hungry,"—not "to bow down thy head as the bulrush and to afflict thy soul"; or in the teaching which another imposed, "Cease to do evil, learn to do well"; or another, "What doth the Lord require of thee but to do justly, to love mercy, and to walk humbly?"

In passing, I would remark that Unitarians have been much accused of teaching salvation by "mere morality"; and they in turn, perhaps, have accused the Ethical Culturists of so teaching. But did Jesus so teach? Morality, by the by, it should be claimed, is not necessarily "mere." Purity, veracity, a great and noble holiness, hardly merit this belittling appellation. Rather than using the diminutive, "mere," Jesus himself always intensified morals. He said, "Except your righteousness exceed the righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees, ye cannot enter the kingdom of heaven,"—which was "at hand." Again, he declared, "Ye have heard that it hath been said, 'Thou shalt not kill'; but I say unto you, Thou shalt not be angry without cause. Ye have heard, 'Thou shalt not commit adultery'; but I say, Thou shalt not look with eyes of lust. Ye have heard [from the so-called law of God], 'An eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth'; but I say unto you, Resist not evil. Ye have heard, 'Love thy neighbor, and hate thine enemy'; but I say, Love your enemies; do good to them that persecute you."

In the exposition of my main purpose in this article, the first instance in the teaching of Jesus which I would cite is recorded in Matthew xix., 16–21, and also in Mark x., 17–22. A young, rich man runs to Jesus, and, kneeling,

anxiously inquires, "What good thing shall I do that I may have eternal life?" What should he do to be saved! This was the solemn and important question; to which Jesus gave a solemn and sufficient answer. I do not believe he gave a trifling or inadequate reply. "Keep the commandments," was the important response:—the very answer that liberal religion is giving to-day. But, "Which?" inquired the earnest questioner. Those of the ceremonial law? No; rites and ceremonies were of little import with Jesus compared with the "weightier things" of the law. Which, then? the "ten commandments"? Nay. The four of the first table, stating special duties of man to God? Not one of these four. But the commandments of the second table, stating man's duty to his fellow-man,—the words "Thou shalt not covet" giving place to the grander statement, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." "This do and thou shalt live."

The young man, however, thought he had done all this from his youth up, and so declared. "What lack I further?" he inquired, persistently. "Then Jesus, beholding him, loved him." Jesus had respect for morality when he saw it. But the young man, rigidly honest as he was, was eager, in all this questioning, only for himself. He was following the modern advice to "look well to the saving of *your own soul.*" But "he that would save his life shall lose it"; while he that will lose himself in saving others is himself most richly saved. The lack of real love in the young man was seen, too, in the fact that, while he had grown rich in the hardened condition of foreign oppression under which the people of Palestine then lived, he had not learned to bless the wretched poor. The people were in such need that if a man found his lost sheep he called in his neighbors to rejoice with him; and if a woman, having ten pieces of silver, lost one, she would sweep the house—the one room which she had—till she found it, and then call her neighbors, saying, "Rejoice with me, for I have found my lost ten-cent piece." Such parables would have had no significance to the people of the times had they not lived in great poverty.

Did this young man love his neighbor? "Sell, and give," came the command. But, no! he couldn't give, for he didn't love much. And that failure in love was the "One thing thou lackest";—that failure in love for needy man.

The religion of Jesus, then, as taught by himself to this inquirer, was to do for men not only all that is required by so-called justice, but to do, further, what love requires. From one point of view, "mere" morality *may* be regarded as the complying alone with the demands of simple

justice; but *religion* is to comply with the full, unmeasured demands of love.

In the second instance to which I shall refer, the same teaching is given,—the parable of the "good Samaritan." The priest and the Levite, in this second story of Jesus, thought their highest duty was the direct service of God at the altar. They were not to pollute their hands by descending to the service of man, beyond the requisitions of simple justice. The despised Samaritan, on the contrary, gave his oil and wine, gave the use of his beast, gave his money,—which justice, in the ordinary sense of that word, did not require him to do. The parable now in mind (Luke x., 25–37) was given in answer to the same great question as before, "What shall I do to inherit eternal life"?—this time propounded by "a certain lawyer." The lawyer had just quoted a statement of his "whole duty," in two precepts; "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart; and thy neighbor as thyself." Jesus himself, when he stated the sum of human duty in two precepts only, had used these two. But when he stated all in one precept, he said, "Do unto others as ye would that they should do to you"; and he added, "for this is the law and the prophets,"—an expression which meant, "all that is required."

The reason, apparently, why love, and the deeds of love to man, comprised in Jesus' teaching the whole of human duty, was because, in his mind, the service of man was the very best possible worship of God. "Not every one that saith, 'Lord, Lord,' but he that doeth the divine will": not he that simply "believeth in God," for "the devils believe, and tremble."

Again, from Matthew xxv., 31–46, it appears that while Jesus held the popular ideas of his time in regard to future punishment, he did not hold the popular ideas in regard to the *basis of judgment.* Undoubtedly he held the popular notions in regard to God. But he distinguished himself in this, that he saw, as Paul stated later, that "God is not worshiped as though he needed anything," but through service to the child, man, who does need. The best service to a mother, if she herself were not in want, would be the rescue of her tempted, perishing boy;—service of her better far, than any praise of her personal beauty or excellence. So in this picture of the Judgment, Matthew xxv.,—and it is only a picture,—Jesus represents men as condemned, not for any violation of the ordinary principles of justice, much less for any lack of the commonly imposed outward "expressions of worship"; but for want of love. "I was sick and imprisoned, I was naked, and hungry, and thirsty, and a

stranger, and ye did not minister unto me. And inasmuch as ye did it not unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye did it not to me." Love's service of God's child, humanity, Jesus regarded as the highest service of "the Father."

In the parable of the rich man and Lazarus, Luke x., 19–31, some have supposed that the rich man was condemned, in Jesus' mind, because he was rich. But it appears to me that he was condemned because, in all his wealth and luxury, he would permit a fellow-man, unable to work because of his sores, to starve on his door-step, refusing to "give" since naked "justice" did not demand it. He should have recognized the demands of love — so Jesus thought.

I need hardly remind the reader that the text in Mark xvi., which makes Jesus teach salvation through "belief," is confessedly spurious. The fact that the disciples answered the question, "What shall I do to be saved?" by saying, "Believe," is one of many proofs of Jesus' superiority to the average men of his time, and of their incapacity even to understand him when he attempted to teach that his belief in demons, and perhaps in hell, or even in God, was in no sense essential to salvation, nor the essence of religion. Correct or incorrect, he did not regard those beliefs, which even devils might hold in common with himself, as worthy to be compared with the weighty matters of the law of love to man. "When thou bringest thy gift to God, and at the altar remember that a brother hath aught against thee, leave there thy gift upon the altar; go first and be reconciled to thy brother." God can wait. He is in no need of your gift. But do not compel justice and love to wait. Man needs now. Even the "Sabbath," which, in the commonly held notions of the time, was made for God,— was "God's day,"— Jesus declared not so: "The Sabbath was made for man."

Even teachers inferior to Jesus, in the New Testament, sometimes rose to grasp the same idea; as, for instance, "If ye fulfill the royal law, viz., Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself, ye do well." Again, "All the law is fulfilled in this one word, viz., Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." Further, "Pure religion is to visit the fatherless and widow in their affliction, and to keep unspotted." The deeds of love, superadded to a spotless life, are "pure religion." The apostles perhaps caught this from the teaching of Jesus, though at about that time it was beginning to be more and more in the air in many quarters, Jewish and Pagan.

I conclude, then, the religion of Jesus was a "Character Religion," as Liberals to-day call it; or, an "Ethical

Religion," as the Ethical Culturists call it. In the broad and generous spirit, therefore, of the teacher who said, "He that is not against us is for us," may we, whatever our own faith, never forbid those who cast out devils, though they follow not with us.

PERRY MARSHALL.

TRUE MEN.

THE truest men are not mere money-makers ;
They sense a higher worth :
Are not ascetics like the monks and Shakers,
But love the good of earth.

And they are willing long and hard to labor
For all that they require ;
Nor would they cheat a brother, friend, or neighbor,
But to be just aspire.

Although they are not rich in worldly treasure,
They surely are not poor !
But as they sow expect returning measure,
And count their blessings sure.

Full well they know the soul has higher riches
Than gems of earth can buy :
Their truer wealth is stored up in the niches
Of the bright world "on high" :—

The peaceful world of loving thought and feeling,
Free from all trace of sin,
Which is the glory of to-day's revealing,
The perfect heaven within.

S. CARTER.

THE EVOLUTION OF LIBERTY.

ALL progress in human affairs must move along two lines, the diagonal of which is civilization. These two lines are those of the individual and of the State. All reform must be either an attempt to directly better the individual by working upon him, or to indirectly benefit him by improving the State. Naturally enough, these two tendencies result in the two philosophies, one of which believes in the innate in man, and builds on that; the other of which, believing man to be the result of his environments, seeks to improve them.

The intuitionalist is naturally an individualist in thought, a socialist in feeling; the man of opposite philosophy is naturally a socialist in thought; — provided that both are logical to the end of thinking, i. e., action. But

abiding somewhere there is a tendency onward; and in this tendency both Individualism and Association are born, and from this point it is on together evermore.

Man cannot exist without Society any more than atoms can exist without worlds. Atoms attract and repel till a point of equilibrium is reached, and a universe is the result. So man attracts and repels his neighbor until the home, the tribe, the State, are builded. Centripetal and centrifugal forces meet in rock and in solar system, and by this unity the independence of each atom within its own orbit is preserved in an interdependence of each upon all. Man is governed by the same law. Through self-protection, he demands personal liberty — individualism — and is centrifugal; flying off in a tangent from his fellows. His social instincts, his necessities, his weaknesses, his loves, are centripetal, and draw him to his kind; and association is the result. Sometime, as the planets in our solar system have found each a point of equilibrium, and an orbit of its own within the larger unity of all, so in society a point will be reached where individuality will be preserved in a unity of all, and then the dream of "a perfect man in a perfect State" will be realized.

All valid objections to any proposed reform are those that show its interference, on the one hand, with personal liberty, and on the other, with social and civil duties; while its advocates must show that it tends to perfect these. The most common objection to Nationalism is that it interferes with individuality. It is "The Coming Slavery," and its present advocacy is "The Mask of Tyranny." Both these objections are born in the old theological conception of the universe, although most strenuously advocated by those who have discarded the theological ideas. It is not easy for a person to change the entire habit of his thinking. A logical application to human government of the principles now held by evolutionists will, I think, make all scientists and believers in evolution Nationalists. There must be as great a revolution in Political Economy as there has been in Theology. Nationalism is an attempt to put political science into harmony with all other sciences. In ancient thought the universe was governed by a transcendent — "an absentee" — God, who, sitting upon a throne above the heavens, watched his machine of a universe as it revolved. In modern thought, we have an immanent God, within the universe, which is an organism; we study as it evolves. The force is within, and out-working.

Heretofore, in Political Economy, "the State" has transcended the people. "The Government" is the power above and without the people, compelling the obedience of the people to itself. This is true of the autocratic govern-

ments to-day. But ever since the people began to limit the power of the chief, there has been a constant decentralization of that governing power, until, in our country, the ideal is its complete transfusion among the people, making it "a government of the people and by the people." But that ideal is not realized. Not yet does that power reside in the people, but is delegated by them to "a government" virtually as distinct from them as that of Czar from his people or Jehovah from the Jews. Nationalism would place the power where it is in ideal in our Constitution. "We — the people," it says. Nationalism is an attempt to make the government immanent, where it is now transcendent either in Legislatures, Syndicates, or Corporations. The distinction between Nationalism and the present system is the same distinction as exists between the Divine government of John Calvin and the idea of government in the mind of Herbert Spencer. All government must be from within. It is a peculiar fact that all the opponents of Nationalism who have repudiated Calvin's idea in the universal, hold to it in particulars, and constantly discuss socialistic questions with the idea that the only earthly government must be a transcendent one.

Individuals make the State, and what they are the State will be. The true function of the State is to develop the individual. The best man is he who is self-governed and needs no law: therefore he who is the least governed externally is the best governed. Still, it does not follow that we want less government; rather, more, for man is not yet perfect. The tendency in the past, however, has ever been towards too much external government. Nationalists propose a State where there shall be more government; where men shall be "governed" less, but *govern* more; a State wherein the governing power is immanent, wherein each individual feels his responsibility as an atom in the great whole, and, forgetting that he is in any way governed, governs by doing all that his mental, moral and physical powers enable him to do as *part of the government.* In scientific thought each individual atom preserves its personality, into whatever combination it enters, because of the immanence of the power governing all. Why, then, should not individual man do the same under a proper human government? The Divine government under the new, scientific idea of things in the universe, is the model; and when we have established our institutions upon the same perfect plan they also will be perfect. Freedom is the necessity of individuality, and he only is free who is governed from within.

The progress of the race has been ever accompanied by a gradual extension of the governing power. This is the evolution of Freedom. The power once centralized in one

man is, in our Republic, diffused among parties, syndicates, stock-companies, and like associations. This is a great advance, but the evolution must continue till it becomes so thoroughly decentralized that each citizen is an equal unit in the government, with equal opportunities "to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness." Nationalism is in this line of evolution. Like all great historical movements it stands for greater personal liberty and greater personal responsibility. It bases all its demands on the principle of "the Fatherhood of God and the Brotherhood of Man." Its demand of equal opportunities for all is only a demand that each shall have a chance to be that which Nature made it possible for him, under right human conditions, to be. The first requisite for this is, Liberty. The next, Security against want. The last, Opportunities. Without all of these, neither one is possible. Under competition liberty can be but partial, for the necessities of labor and the fears of capital to a degree enslave both. The morrow may see the one starving in idleness; the other, penniless. Fire, flood, speculation, riot, or war, may make the millionaire a beggar, his sons becoming slaves to the avarice and his daughters the victims of the lust of those whom competition leaves successful or elects to the thrones of power. The security of labor is the corner-stone of liberty. Opportunity to labor and to receive equal return for labor is the economic basis of a true State — is justice. Co-operation is its first law. In the establishment of material security and prosperity which these will bring, the poet's dream, the prophet's vision and the wise man's hope — the liberty of brain, hand and heart — will be found. "The marriage of security with liberty will insure the birth of social harmony."

Liberty that *can* be lost in a struggle for material existence is not liberty. Liberty lost in wage-slavery, lost by "Prisoners of Poverty," is not so great a liberty as that enjoyed by serf under feudal lord, for he was nearer on equality with his lord than sewing-girls, weavers, foundrymen, miners, and brakemen are with their masters to-day. Between laborer in manufactory and millionaire employer, the gap is very much wider than that between serf and noble, peasant and baron, of the middle ages, and is constantly widening. Civil and religious liberty is a theory, but will never be a fact until pecuniary dependence is impossible. The rallying-cry of this new reform is therefore — Industrial Liberty.

If personal liberty consists in being let alone in the struggle for life, then Nationalism is wrong, and so are most of the movements that have resulted in greater civilization. If it consists merely in opportunities for a man to use physical or selfish faculties in a hand-to-hand

contest with his fellows, then competition is its legitimate sphere. If Nature has evolved nothing nobler in man than the egoistic motives, if the possibilities of man have full opportunities for evolution in this struggle for life called competition, then this present demand for Association is wrong. "But man has higher than bodily needs, and some of them are ministered to by enlarging the world of ideas," and others by enlarging the sphere of his affections. He is a mental and moral being, and the purpose of his life is not attained by the gratification of physical needs, the maintenance simply of physical life. The end of his attainment lies in the development of his intellectual, esthetic and moral powers. This development demands leisure, and leisure is relief from the over-plus of the struggle for life. Industrial liberty, through security of labor, will give the needed leisure. The slavery of the many gave this leisure to the few, in Greece, Rome and other ancient nations. Machinery makes this leisure possible to-day for all. Possible, however, only under a just, nationalized system of industry, which distributes it rightfully among the people.

The opportunities for this development,—the leisure and the aids necessary,—cannot be attained by isolated communities. Society alone can furnish them. These opportunities mean (to quote Prof. Sumner) "The right to be all that Nature made it possible to be." Therefore the State exists not merely to protect me in a contest with my fellows, but it exists as a means of mutual helpfulness. The history of the evolution of man from barbarism proves that if man became, in process of growth, gregarious, to protect himself from his enemies, he expected in this protection to help and be helped; and only on this basis of helpfulness was any co-operation possible. The evolution of the State is through this continued necessity for mutual help. Beginning on the low plane of help against beast and savage foe, it has evolved into help against moral evils, and for intellectual and moral growth.

Helpfulness is consistent with the greatest personal liberty. It is simply furnishing those conditions through which Nature has made evolution of the individual possible. Helpfulness is therefore almost synonymous with liberty. Hindrance is the placing of obstacles in the line of evolution, and is therefore synonymous with slavery. Civilization is the result of the development of helpfulness among men, or co-operation. Further progress is possible only through the development of further sympathy and help. Only through this development of sympathy and helpfulness does man become noble. Only those in whom it is manifested does the world honor.

"He loved his fellow-men — his rest is sweet.
Plant daisies at his head and at his feet."

The world stops in its selfishness to build monuments to its redeemers. "In the development and satisfaction of the sympathies lies the hope of establishing a true brotherhood among men." Out of sympathy arises action, and that action is helpfulness. To quicken sympathy between man and man is to promote harmonious social action. This will result in the economy of labor, in co-operation, in intelligence and happiness. There has never been but one way since the dawn of human life for man to

"Work out the beast,
And let the ape and tiger die";

and that has been through caring for his fellow-men. "Love thy neighbor as thyself" is a law written in the moral nature of man.

States are aggregations of individuals. What makes the individual noble makes the collection noble. Therefore well says Prof. Ladd, "The State should not be satisfied with doing what is necessary to the bare possibilities of existence. Let our theory be that States, in the long run and wide extent of their being, should strive by collective action to mature intelligence, intellectual variety, and the beauty of multiform and high development, in as many as may be of its citizens. This it should do, because it pays, and because it is intrinsically noble" (*Scribner's Magazine*, September, 1889). By thus doing, the State, like a wise physician, is only "assisting Nature" to accomplish her growing work of evolution.

The State should also do this in the interest of personal liberty. For only he who has opportunities of growth is free. Nationalism, in demanding equal opportunities for all, is only demanding that none be enslaved through the denial of opportunity. Unequal opportunities destroy personal liberty by the creation of privileged classes, thus making tyrants and slaves. Unequal opportunities create foemen and war. Equal opportunities create friends and peace. The individual only flourishes as there exists a loyal devotion to the source of good, the State itself. This function of helpfulness is recognized in all legislatures man ever had, and it is extending in practice in an ever-widening field. From the days of the Confederation to the present, our government has been extending its help to the people,— or, rather, in more exact phrase, the people in their corporate capacity are gradually doing more and more for themselves. If the extension of this principle from turnpike to highway, from private to public school, from stock-companies to municipal water-supply, from irresponsible corporations running an insurance

business or railroads, to the present corporations carefully watched by a Board of Commissioners, has not interfered with personal liberty, why should the entire assumption of both railroad and insurance companies by the State thus interfere? It will be only the extension of a principle which, if *right*, cannot go too far. If West Point, Annapolis, State universities, and public schools, leave personal liberty intact, why should trade, industrial and technical schools established by the State injure it? If students can be taught in those and not be limited in personal liberty, why should they be limited when they pass into the practice of nationalized industries? If employees in post-offices, and government clerks, are not enslaved, why need the employees of government railroads and telegraph-lines become so? If the city can, without danger, employ men to pave and to clean its streets, where would lie the danger to liberty if it employed them to lay rails and run cars? If all these things can be done with safety to personal liberty under the "spoils system," will not the civil-service system under Nationalism give still greater security?

That the Association which the nationalization of all industries would bring would give greater security to personal liberty, that it offers the only opportunity possible for a complete development of individuality, and that it is the only possible secure foundation for our nation, is the belief of the Nationalists. There would be only one source of power — the nation; and that power, like God in the universe, immanent and evolvent. Justice would be done, in equal rewards for labor and equal opportunities; security against want provided for, by the security of labor in its right to earn; the necessary leisure provided for the development of the higher faculties, through an equitable participation by all in the world's necessary labor. Thus, life, liberty, labor and leisure being secure, all other things desired in "the pursuit of happiness" might be his who willed to have them.

H. H. Brown.

GENERAL TOPICS.

THE OTHER SIDE.

"The other side" is always welcome to representation in our pages — limited only by the limits of space.

FREE TRADE VS. PROTECTION.

It is customary for the author of a disputed article to have the privilege of responding to his opposer. In order that the readers of the current discussion in The New

IDEAL on the topic as above may have the benefit of the arguments in a single issue, the proofs of Mr. Hawkins' article were sent to Mr. Holland, and the latter's rejoinder will be found following Mr. Hawkins' paper in the present issue.

THE STORY OF SPRING VALLEY.

IF Mr. Salter's book-review in the present number sounds "forceful," be it remembered that there is a "righteous indignation," and that the Story of Spring Valley is a story of harshness and hypocrisy — an altogether "nefarious business," as Mr. Salter justly characterizes it.

DR. HOLMES SPEAKS OUT IN MEETING.

GREATLY to be desired is plainness of speech; yea, more to be desired than much word-mouthing. But Doctor Holmes is recklessly courting (what indeed he is already beginning to receive) a good orthodox berating, and a sad decline of orthodox esteem. And moreover, can the *Atlantic* survive it? Will not that come in also for a share of the sorrow?— will not the tide of the *Atlantic's* popularity fall an inch or two on the orthodox beach? But what a marvelous influence the good Doctor's word will have, in quarters where even Parker or Frothingham would fail because to be deemed "partisans." The Doctor yet, before he dies, will be progressive enough to write for THE NEW IDEAL. Indeed, we cannot but require him to speak here now:

> The generally professed belief of the Protestant world as embodied in their published creeds is that the great mass of mankind are destined to an eternity of suffering. That this eternity is to be one of bodily pain — of "torment"— is the literal teaching of Scripture, which has been literally interpreted by the theologians, the poets, and the artists of many long ages which followed the acceptance of the recorded legends of the Church as infallible. The doctrine has always been recognized, as it is now, as a very terrible one. It has found a support in the story of the fall of man, and the view taken of the relation of man to his Maker since that event. The hatred of God to mankind in virtue of their "first disobedience" and inherited depravity is at the bottom of it. The extent to which that idea was carried is well shown in expressions from Jonathan Edwards. According to his teaching,— and he was a reasoner who knew what he was talking about, what was involved in the promises of the faith he accepted,— man inherits the curse of God as his principal birthright.
>
> What shall we say to the doctrine of the fall of man as the ground of inflicting endless misery on the human race? A man to be *punished* for what he could not help! He was expected to be called to account for Adam's sin. It is singular to notice that the reasoning of the wolf with the lamb should be transferred to the dealings of the Creator with his creatures. "You stirred the brook up and made my drinking-place muddy." "But, please your wolfship, I couldn't do that, for I stirred the water far down the stream,— below your drinking-place." "Well, anyhow, your father troubled it a year or two ago, and that is the same thing."

So the wolf falls upon the lamb and makes a meal of him. That is wolf logic,—and theological reasoning.

How shall we characterize the doctrine of endless torture as the destiny of most of those who have lived, and are living, on this planet? I prefer to let another writer speak of it. Mr. John Morley uses the following words: "The horrors of what is perhaps the most frightful idea that has corroded human character,—the idea of eternal punishment." Sismondi, the great historian, heard a sermon on eternal punishment, and vowed never again to enter another church holding the same creed. Romanism he considered a religion of mercy and peace by the side of what the English call the Reformation. I mention these protests because I happen to find them among my notes, but it would be easy to accumulate examples of the same kind. When Cowper, at about the end of the last century, said satirically of the minister he was attacking,

"He never mentioned hell to ears polite,"

he was giving unconscious evidence that the sense of the barbarism of the idea was finding its way into the pulpit. When Burns, in the midst of the sulphurous Orthodoxy of Scotland, dared to say,

"The fear o' hell's a hangman's whip
To haud the wretch in order,"

he was only appealing to the common sense and common humanity of his fellow-countrymen.

Where did this "frightful idea" come from? We are surprised, as we grow older, to find that the legendary hell of the Church is nothing more nor less than the Tartarus of the old heathen world. It has every mark of coming from the cruel heart of a barbarous despot. Some malignant and vindictive Sheik, some brutal Mezentius, must have sat for many pictures of the Divinity. It was not enough to kill his captive enemy, after torturing him as much as ingenuity could contrive to do it. He escaped at last by death, but his conqueror could not give him up so easily, and so his vengeance followed him into the unseen and unknown world. How the doctrine got in among the legends of the Church we are no more bound to show than we are to account for the intercalation of the "three witnesses" text, or the false insertion, or false omission, whichever it may be, of the last fourteen verses of the Gospel of St. Mark. We do not hang our grandmothers now, as our ancestors did theirs, on the strength of the positive command, "Thou shalt not suffer a witch to live."

THE KREUTZER SONATA AND THE OTHERS.

It is a hopeful sign, amid the current whirlpool of criticism on Tolstoi's latest book, that not all is denunciatory.

So all but untaught, so horribly ill-taught, so fearfully mistaught, so wretchedly and abominably taught, are ninety-nine out of every hundred boys and girls, young men and young women, in the matters of their sex-nature, that every such book as the "Kreutzer Sonata" and the "Strike of a Sex," however in some points possibly extreme; every such periodical as *Lucifer* and the *Word*, however frequently their earnest conductors (even if perchance at times indiscreet) are hounded, imprisoned and "fined" in the name of "purity" and "the law" by prurient-minded, short-sighted, and tyrannous-handed

bigots; every such book or tract as "Diana" and the publications of the Alphites, should be welcomed and encouraged with jubilant eagerness, by each earnest-hoping and high-endeavoring son and daughter of mankind. Probably there were never before so many pure-hearted and wise-minded men and women as to-day, thinking and working on the lines of man's and woman's greater freedom from the dominion of mere passionate fleshly self-gratification. Truly, there may not be any greater beastiless and horror of darkness, and utterly unrestrained self-pandering in the matter, in any one of a dozen or more shameful ways, to-day than in past ages; granted even that there is less: yet each new day one takes up his morning paper with greater and greater dread — for the crimes, the fiendishness, the shamelessness, the abuses, the agonies, even the frequent murders and suicides, rampant in this and all other countries as a consequence of abnormal habits and excesses in this one passionate line alone, well make one to shudder and grow faint in very soul-sickness. Welcome, under such awful regime as this, even Tolstoi's utter suicide of the race through ultra chastity, rather than any longer the present mighty, loathsome horror of unrestrained passion and its accompanying miseries, not one hundredth or one thousandth part of which ever reaches public ear. Well is it that greater and greater things of self-control are being more and more trumpeted to-day from the world's housetops. Men sadly need the counsel, the wise word. For so long as young men and young women grow up continuing here all untaught, or, through the mis-counsels of their companions or elders, continuing to be taught and to believe, that the one great and only use of the sex-nature is sensual indulgence; that the gratification of sex-lust to whatever monstrous extreme, if only "within the marriage-rite," is legitimate and without evil consequence; that a certain large or small amount of "prostitution" even, outside of marriage, is possibly to be winked at, or even legally "licensed"; — or, indeed, that gratification of the sex-impulse at all, is absolutely *necessary*, and essential to the perfection of body and brain, — so long will the mocking, magnified imaginations, and the unchaste burnings and longings of budding youth make early life a hell of ungratified desire, or a baser hell of secret self-despoiling — or of lured or forced sex-gratification, thus damning also some other, the deluded or unwilling partner in the wretchedness. And so long, moreover, will pain, weakness, disease, and nameless horror stalk abroad in the enfeebled human midst under a hundred euphemistic phrases of medical science, and the groans of wrecked men and abused women rise from hamlet and city, — while every man or woman who raises

voice in plain Saxon word to warn or lead is banned and prison-barred. Suppress the "Kreutzer Sonata"? The rather, bewail it not if a myriad men and women, reading it, vow for themselves, for life, even its extreme of sex-asceticism! Certainly no harm will thus be done. The extreme of chastity, where accompanied by earnest will and the possible purity of thought acquirable by all, it is now well shown retards not health, nor affects unfavorably any function of life. (Witness, as one great example, the giant-minded Newton, whose boast it was, late in his career, that never during all his life was a single drop of the generative fluid ever permitted to leave his body. He preferred it reabsorbed into the system, and transformed into finer brain-tissue and the exuberance and freshness of youth even in the extreme of old age, to its wanton expenditure and loss in mere momentary fleshly gratification.) And at least, as a happy consequence of the voluntary, willing self-suppression of such "myriad" as has been hinted at, would there fail of earthly life a triple or sextuple myriad of possible other souls! And, for the great multitude, under present ill-usages of society and man's individual ignorance of the true course of blessedness, to fail of "life" is to fail of much bitterness and pain and shame.

CORRESPONDENCE.

OBLIGATION AND THE SENSE OF OBLIGATION.

In common parlance we distinguish between realities and our apprehension of them. Science has disclosed to us an orderly universe; still we are not accustomed to think of the orderliness as coming into being with the birth of Science. The law of gravitation is older than Newton; and our emotion towards it as well as our knowledge of it is quite different from the thing itself. In a somewhat similar way I have been accustomed to think of the law of duty, or the moral law. When I become aware of a duty, I seem to myself to become conscious of something independent of me, though having the closest practical relation to me. I feel that it is not something I make, any more than I do a fact of my senses; it is objective, it exists all the same whether I fulfill it or not—it is in one sense independent of my knowledge of it; it is *there to be known;* my knowledge does not constitute it. So far duty is like gravitation. But it is also very unlike gravitation. Gravitation as a force never ceases to act; at least we are accustomed to think so. There are of course other physical forces, and the effect which gravitation alone would have is sometimes neutralized by the action of other forces. None the less is gravitation itself constant. Our attitude towards it, our consent to it, or emotion of whatever character, does not in the slightest affect its action. A duty, however, certainly does not act of itself. We may have a perfectly clear vision of it and yet it be without practical effect. We may dally with it, we may postpone doing it, we may shrink from it, we may juggle ourselves into the notion of its non-existence; only as we consent to it does it act; in fact, it does not, properly speaking, act at all—*we* are

the actors in the matter, and it is only the *ideal or rule according to which* we should act. (How our consent is determined, i. e., the problem of free-will, is entirely aside.) In other words, duty is like gravitation in that it is objective, and yet unlike it in that it (duty) is an ideal, rule, or command, and not a necessarily acting force.

All this I have said many times; and I briefly resaid it in response to what seemed to me signs of confusion in Mr. Gronlund's mind (June NEW IDEAL). I was accordingly taken aback at Dr. Janes' misconception of my meaning in the succeeding number (July-August). According to him, I assume the moral law "to be wholly subjective," and I appear to be classed with those "metaphysicians" (I am sure I do not know who they are) who maintain that "it is identical with the sense of obligation in the individual mind." The *sense* of obligation is just what appears to me to need to be clearly distinguished from the *reality of obligation itself.* I have devoted a whole chapter in "Ethical Religion" to the discussion of the question — the chapter, namely, which bears the title, "Is there anything Absolute about Morality?" I agree to all that Dr. Janes says about the lack of fixedness or constancy in the *sense* of obligation; not only have I said naught to the contrary, I have expressly and repeatedly acknowledged the facts. The *sense* of obligation belongs to the individual mind, is subject to growth, perversion and decay; so is science. But the realities, the laws of which science is a more or less perfect apprehension, are not affected by any subjective changes in the individual; and I cannot see why changes in the moral *sense* need any more affect our confidence that the moral law itself (the law of justice, for example) is unchanged and unchangeable.

I am not sure that Dr. Janes means by "moral law" what I mean. He says the moral law is a summary and abstract statement of actual conditions on which men *may* * live harmoniously together in society. In this sense, "moral law" is certainly of a piece with "physical law." But in speaking of moral law I have always had in mind a rule or imperative as to how men *should* or *ought to* live. Duty is more than what one may do if he wishes to live harmoniously with his fellows; it is really what one should do, whether he wishes to so live or not. In the strict sense of the term, Dr. Janes does not seem to me to give us a "moral law" at all, but certain matters of fact derived from a study of history and sociology. If such and such conditions are observed men will live harmoniously together; if they are not observed, men will not so live. I agree with Dr. Janes entirely that there is this fixed and constant tendency; but to call this the moral law is surely confusing — at least, it nowise corresponds to what I had in mind in speaking of the moral law. Injustice produces unhappiness and disruption of the social ties; who does not see that it is one thing to say this and another to say, Do not practise injustice? The one is the statement of a fact, the other the statement of a command or moral law. The moral law in this sense (and it is the usual sense) is being continually disregarded; it is very true that in consequence we suffer, or some one suffers, just as in a well-conducted commonwealth anyone suffers who disregards its laws; but there is no such thing, strictly speaking, as disregarding or disobeying the law of gravitation, since that law is not a thing that could be disregarded, i. e., is not an ideal or command or rule, but merely a statement of an unvarying actual tendency.

As to the *sense* of obligation passing away, I can certainly conceive that it may; but not obligation itself. Obligation inheres essentially in the idea of a law. It is, however, perfectly true

* The italics are mine.

that one may, and it is indeed the height of moral attainment when one does, find in one's duty one's life and one's joy.

Professor Dolbear's corrections seem to be mainly verbal. I did not say that the law of gravitation was a tendency, but the statement of a tendency. Gravitation itself (so far as it can be experimentally dealt with) is a tendency, as it appears to me. The only point at which I could dissent from Professor Dolbear is in his apparent implication that the law of gravitation is a mathematical relation which "*in the nature of things cannot be different.*" I confess I cannot discover how it is possible to reach such an insight into the nature of things. I do not mean to dispute the fact; but how did Professor Dolbear learn it? Is there no difference between mathematical knowledge and physical knowledge? Certainly one can *conceive* of other relations between physical bodies than those which actually exist. How are we competent to pronounce them not merely unreal, but in the nature of things impossible?

WILLIAM M. SALTER.

BOOK NOTES.

A Strike of Millionaires against Miners; or, The Story of Spring Valley. An open letter to the Millionaires. By Henry D. Lloyd. Chicago: Belford-Clarke Co., 1890. Pages, 264; price, cloth, $1.00; paper, 50 cents.

Mr. Lloyd has been until recently on the editorial staff of the Chicago *Tribune*, and is now devoting his time to first-hand investigations into labor-troubles. This book gives an account of a lock-out in one of the mining-districts of Illinois—and is the more forcible and eloquent an arraignment of the "millionaires" (and particularly of the Hon. W. L. Scott of Pennsylvania, the President of the Coal Company) as the statements are throughout verifiable. As Mr. Lloyd in effect says, professors of political economy do not come near enough to realities to discover such details as he portrays, and the workingmen do not know how to bring them before public opinion. Hence the necessity of a mediator, who shall thoroughly investigate the facts and at the same time give them to the public (not in statistical reports, but) in a form that compels its attention. Mr. Lloyd is a practised writer; no one can read this narrative without being profoundly moved, and for the directors and stockholders of the Spring Valley Coal Company (and besides of the Chicago and North Western Railway, an aider and abettor in the nefarious business) the effect must be to set their blood on fire—so far as they are blessed (or unblessed) with any moral sensitiveness. Every thoughtful citizen—whether man or woman—should read this book and have fully brought home to him or her the problems it suggests. It belongs to the literature both of fact and of power. On the title-page stands a quotation from Emerson, "It is high time *our bad wealth* came to an end"; and the book is announced as No. 1 of "Our Bad Wealth" Series. Why should not a later number devote itself to the devious ways of the Standard Oil Company? The New York *Nation* recently (24th July) gave an account of a bill favorably reported in the English House of Commons to fix more definitely the liabilities of directors for false or misleading statements in prospectuses—evidently in the interest of investors. Why should not something similar be done in our own country in the interest of *working people and their families*, who may be enticed away from their homes by such lying and hypocritical advertisements as were sent forth by the Hon. W. L. Scott (see pp. 187–191)? WM. M. S.

BOOKS RECEIVED—FOR LATER NOTICE.

[From the Humboldt Publishing Co., New York.]

The Quintessence of Socialism, by Prof. A. Schaffle; Darwinism and Politics, by David G. Ritchie, M.A., accompanied by Administrative Nihilism, by Thomas H. Huxley; Physiognomy and Expression, parts I. and II., by Paolo Mantegazza,—the four pamphlets above named being, respectively, Nos. 124, 125, 126 and 127 of The Humboldt Library; the first two, 15 cents each, and the last two, 30 cents each.

[From Geo. H. Ellis, Boston.]

Unitarian Catechism. By M. J. Savage. With Introduction by E. A. Horton. Pages, 67; 20 cents.

[From the Truth-Seeker Co., New York.]

The Freethinkers' Pictorial Text-Book. One hundred and eighty five full-page illustrations, with copious citations of fact, history, statistics, etc. Designs by Watson Heston. Pages, nearly 400, 12 by 9 inches; board covers. $2.00.

[From Brentano's, New York.]

Christ: the Pupil of Buddha. A Comparative Study. Pamphlet, 31 pages, 25c.